

	Middle Years Programme	Form F3.1
	Moderation coversheet: Subjects	

Please complete a copy of this form for **each** folder of work submitted for moderation.

Please ensure that the material being submitted for moderation conforms to the requirements set out in the relevant subject group guide. All the criteria **must be applied twice** within the folder accompanying this form, unless stated otherwise in the subject guide.

School name: VICTORIA SHANGHAI ACADEMY School code: 002634

Student's name/number: Cindy Cheng Subject: MATHS (Extended)

The student's work is (please mark box):

☐ comparatively good
 ☒ average
 ☐ comparatively weak

Nature and title of assessment task		Criteria					
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1. <i>Summative Assessment (broad-based)</i>	Teacher	5		5			
	Moderator						
2. <i>Transformation</i>	Teacher		4	4			
	Moderator						
3. <i>Vectors and Matrices</i>	Teacher		7		4		
	Moderator						
4. <i>AP, GP, exponential, logarithms</i>	Teacher	7			4		
	Moderator						
5.	Teacher						
	Moderator						

Please use the reverse of this form or separate sheets to identify the conditions under which each piece of work was done (project, classroom test, end-of-term examination, and so on), the amount of support provided, any special circumstances, and general/specific information on the student. Provide any information that may assist the moderators in determining how the criteria were applied.

Name of teacher: William Wong

Signature of teacher: William Wong Date: 11/03/2013

Names of teachers involved in internal standardization for this subject:

Echo Li, Kenneth So, William Wong

Teacher's comments:

Task	Criterion	Remarks
Summative Assessment (broad-based)	A	<p>Cindy earned a level 5 in criterion A. On the challenging questions (10 & 11), she got parts 10a, 10b, and 10d completely correct, had a slight confusion on 10c taking the bearing from B to A instead of from A to B which was considered a minor error, and made many appropriate deductions on question 11, but had trouble solving the quadratic. Cindy has generally made appropriate deductions on these challenging questions.</p> <p>Cindy correctly completed questions on trigonometry (2 & 5), similar triangles (6), and equations of lines (7). She demonstrated appropriate deductions on bearings (9 & 10) and constructing equations from word problems (11). This shows Cindy generally making appropriate deductions in a variety of familiar contexts.</p> <p>Cindy is therefore clearly in the level 5-6 box. Due to the number of errors she made, however, it was felt that she was on the lower end of generally making appropriate deductions and so she was awarded a level 5 instead of a level 6.</p>
	C	<p>Cindy achieved level 5 in Criterion C. She could explain most problems in the whole paper step by step (Q7b). She demonstrated a good use of mathematical language and forms of mathematical representation in most questions (Q13, 7).</p>

		<p>She also moved between diagrams, equations, mathematical short hands and words effectively in (Q9, 10 and 13)</p> <p>The lines of reasoning were mostly clear and logical and complete (Q5-7). Since she was mostly but not always correct, she was awarded a level 5 instead of a level 6.</p>
Transformation	B	<p>Cindy achieved level 4 in Criterion B because she could do most of the questions in Part A (1 - 3, 4, 7) and could apply knowledge to the unfamiliar situations in Part B (8 - 10). Cindy was able to suggest general rules in Q1-3 but not 5-6. She also recognizes and applies problem solving techniques to recognize patterns in Q10</p> <p>However she was not able to describe relationships or draw conclusions as required in Q11 - 15 and 17. She could not get a 5 or above because she was not able to deduce a general form for question 12. Furthermore, she could not apply or justify any general rule in question 13. Overall, she could not really describe a relationship mathematically nor prove mathematically the rules in the task.</p>
	C	<p>Cindy achieved level 4 in Criterion C. She could generally use correct terminology in her answers. Equations were mostly written clearly, narrative could be followed. Her lines of reasoning were clear but not always logical, complete or accurate (e.g. Q 7, 14). She demonstrated a sufficient use of mathematical language and forms of mathematical representation in most questions. She also moved between diagrams, equations, with some success in (Q1-4,8-10)</p> <p>She was awarded a level 4 instead of a level 5 or 6 because the reasoning was not</p>

		<p>always concise or logical (Q14, 15) and she struggled with some forms of transformations (Q5, 6, 17).</p>
Vectors and Matrices	B	<p>Cindy was able to answer Part 1 (a) to (m) completely and (n) partly with some minor mistakes/ incomplete answers.</p> <p>Cindy achieved level 7 in Criterion B as she was able to select and apply mathematical problem-solving techniques to recognise patterns and describe them as mathematical relationships and rules (d, e, j). Cindy also drew conclusions consistent with findings (f). As her proof in (n) was not completely correct she could not achieve a level 8.</p>
	D	<p>In Part 2, Cindy could answer (c) (i) and (e) completely. She made careless mistakes with the signs in (a)(i) and (ii), she manipulated algebra wrongly in (c)(ii) and part of (d), she also made the wrong conclusions in (b), (c)(iii) and (c)(iv).</p> <p>Cindy achieved level 4 in Criterion D. She could answer questions (c)(i) and (e) completely and she shows understanding in part (d). She explains whether her results make sense in the context of the problem well (e). But her results (d) was not entirely correct. She was unable explain in details or justify her degree of accuracy hence she was not awarded level 5-6.</p>
	A	<p>Cindy correctly answered Q1-3, 5, 6. Her answers for Q4, 7 were partially correct, but the explanation in Q4 and 8 were wrong.</p> <p>Cindy achieved a level 7 in Criterion A because she justified and used the correct model (Q1), she also made predictions using the model and came up with a new model</p>

AP, GP, exponential, logarithms		using the calculator (Q2, 3, 6). This meant she was generally making appropriate deductions when solving challenging problems including in unfamiliar situations. She was however unable to use the new model to make sensible predictions (Q7). She was also unable to compare her results (Q8). Since she was not able to consistently make deductions in a variety of contexts, she got a level 7 instead of a 8.
	D	Cindy achieved level 4 in Criterion D. She correctly talked about real life changes in Hong Kong (Q5), she also considered the percentage error and used it to choose her model (Q1) i.e. attempts to justify the degree of accuracy of her results. But she was unable to use her new model to make predictions and comparisons, she also did not think critically about the improvements, hence she only got a 4 not a 5 or 6.

